Docket No. UE-210795 - Vol. I

In the Matter of Puget Sound Energy's Clean Energy Implementation Plan

May 9, 2022



206.287.9066 I 800.846.6989

1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840, Seattle, Washington 98101

www.buellrealtime.com

email: info@buellrealtime.com

Certified WBENC

Page 1	Page 3
BEFORE THE WASHINGTON	1 APPEARANCES (Cont.)
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION	FOR NWEC AND FRONT AND CENTERED:
In the Matter of) DOCKET UE-210795	3
PUGET SOUND ENERGY)	AMANDA GOODIN 4 Earthjustice
) Clean Energy Implementation)	810 Third Avenue, Suite 610 5 Seattle, Washington 98104
Plan Pursuant to WAC)	(206) 343-7340
480-100-640))	FOR AWEC:
VIRTUAL PREHEARING CONFERENCE, VOLUME I	7 SOMMER MOSER
Pages 1-35 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE MICHAEL HOWARD	8 Davison Van Cleve
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE MICHAEL HOWARD	1750 SW Harbor Way, Suite 450 Portland, Oregon 97201
	(971) 710-1154 10 sjm@dvclaw.com
May 9, 2022	11 FOR RENEWABLE NORTHWEST:
9:30 a.m.	12
Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission	KATIE WARE 13 Renewable Northwest
621 Woodland Square Loop Southeast Lacey, Washington 98503	421 SW 6th Avenue, Suite 1400 Portland, Oregon 97204
	(503) 223-4544 15 katie@renewablenw.org
DEDODTED BY: TAVI ED CADI INCHOLISE CCD 2250	16 17
REPORTED BY: TAYLER GARLINGHOUSE, CCR 3358	18
Buell Realtime Reporting, LLC 1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840	19 20
Seattle, Washington 98101	21
(206) 287-9066 Seattle (360) 534-9066 Olympia	22 23
(800) 846-6989 National www.buellrealtime.com	24 25
www.bueiiieaiuiiie.com	
Page 2	Page 4
1 APPEARANCES 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:	1 LACEY, WASHINGTON; MAY 9, 2022
3 MICHAEL HOWARD	2 9:30 A.M.
4 5	3000
FOR COMMISSION STAFF:	4 PROCEEDINGS 5
NASH CALLAGHAN Assistant Attorney General	5 JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be on the record. Good
PO Box 40128	7 morning. We're here today for a prehearing conference
8 Olympia, Washington 98504 (360) 915-4521	8 in Docket UE-210795. This case is captioned In the
9 nash.callaghan@utc.wa.gov 10 FOR PUGET SOUND ENERGY:	9 Matter of Puget Sound Energy Clean Energy Implementation
DONNA BARNETT SHEREE STROM CARSON	Plan Pursuant to WAC 480-100-640.
12 Perkins Coie	This is an adjudicatory proceeding regarding
10885 Northeast Fourth Street Suite 700	12 PSE's first Clean Energy Implementation Plan, or CEIP.
Bellevue, Washington 98004 14 (425) 635-1400	13 My name is Michael Howard, and I'm an
dbarnett@perkinscoie.com scarson@perkinscoie.com	administrative law judge with the Commission, and I will be co-presiding in this matter along with the
16 FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL:	16 Commissioners. The Commissioners will not be joining us
17 NINA SUETAKE Attorney General's Office	17 at this particular prehearing conference.
Public Ćounsel Unit 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000	18 Because we may have some interested members
19 Seattle, Washington 98104	of the public on the call, I want to explain the purpose
(206) 389-2055 20 nina.suetake@atg.wa.gov	20 of our conference today.
21 FOR THE ENERGY PROJECT:	This is a meeting for the parties to the
22 SIMON FFITCH Attorney at Law	case, which would include the Company, Staff, Public
22 SIMON FFITCH Attorney at Law 23 321 High School Road NE, Ste D3 Bainbridge Island, Washington 98110	Counsel, and other intervenors. The parties and I will
22 SIMON FFITCH Attorney at Law 23 321 High School Road NE, Ste D3	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,

Page 5 Page 7 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 1 1 around that. 2 2 This meeting is not necessarily intended for Are there any other organizations on the 3 hearing comments from the public. If you would wish to 3 call that would like to give a verbal notice of provide comments, you may file written comments through 4 appearance here? 4 5 5 the Commission's website or you may attend the public All right. Hearing none, let's turn to the 6 comment hearing that will be in the next few months. 6 petitions for intervention. Are there any petitions for 7 The Commissioners will be at that public comment hearing 7 intervention other than the ones that have been filed in 8 and will be able to consider your remarks then. 8 writing in this docket so far? 9 9 So with that explanation in mind, let's All right. Hearing none, we have received 10 four petitions to intervene for the following five 10 start by taking appearances, beginning with Puget Sound 11 organizations: AWEC, The Energy Project, Renewable Energy. 11 MS. BARNETT: Thank you, Your Honor. Donna 12 Northwest, NWEC, and Front and Centered. NWEC and Front 12 13 and Centered being represented by the same counsel. 13 Barnett. My pronouns are she/her, and I'm with Perkins Are there any objections to the written 14 Coie, representing Puget Sound Energy. And with me is 14 15 Sheree Carson. 15 petitions for intervention? MR. CALLAGHAN: No objections from Staff, 16 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 16 17 And could we have an appearance for Staff? 17 Your Honor. 18 MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. Nash 18 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Does any other party wish to indicate an 19 Callaghan, Assistant Attorney General, on behalf of 19 20 Commission Staff. My pronouns are he/him. Thank you. 20 objection? All right. Hearing none -- hearing none, it JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 21 21 22 is -- I will be granting the written petitions to 22 Could we have an appearance for Public intervene filed in this docket so far, and I will be 23 Counsel? 23 24 MS. SUETAKE: Good morning, Your Honor. My 24 addressing this further in the prehearing conference 25 name is Nina Suetake, Assistant Attorney General, for 25 order. Page 6 Page 8 Public Counsel Unit, and my pronouns are she/her. 1 1 So next, turning to the issue of the 2 2 procedural schedule, before the conference today, I JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 3 3 Could we have an appearance for AWEC, emailed the parties, suggesting possible dates for the 4 hearing. I indicated that the Commission could hold the 4 Alliance of Western Energy Consumers? 5 5 MS. MOSER: Good morning, Your Honor. hearing over two days, on January 31st, 2023, and 6 Sommer Moser, with Davison Van Cleve, appearing on 6 February 1st, 2023. 7 behalf of AWEC, and my pronouns are she/her. 7 The parties shared some proposed schedules 8 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 8 over email over the last couple of days. It looks like Could we have an appearance for The Energy 9 9 the parties may still need to discuss and see if they 10 10 can stipulate to a single proposed schedule. Project? MR. FFITCH: Good morning, Your Honor. 11 11 I would ask the parties to keep those two 12 Simon ffitch, on behalf of The Energy Project. 12 hearing dates in mind, given the constraints on the 13 13 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Commission with the two pending general rate cases Could we have an appearance for NWEC and 14 14 proceeding at the same time. 15 15 Front and Centered? And I did note that the parties referred to MS. GOODIN: Good morning, Your Honor. 16 16 the possibility of having a settlement hearing on the 17 Amanda Goodin, with Earthjustice, appearing on behalf of 17 calendar earlier on the schedule than the normal 18 Front and Centered and the Northwest Energy Coalition. 18 evidentiary hearing that would -- that would be towards 19 And Molly Tack-Hooper, also with Earthjustice, is with 19 the end of the schedule in this proceeding. 20 me as well. My pronouns are she/her. 20 And I have suggested this in past cases, and 21 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. 21 I believe it could be useful in this docket, but at the 22 Could we have an appearance for Renewable 22 present moment, it is difficult to find an acceptable 23 23 Northwest? date for settlement hearing because of the two general 24 24 MS. WARE: This is Katie Ware, appearing on rate cases that are pending, which I just mentioned. 25 behalf of Renewable Northwest. 25 It may be possible to hold a settlement

Page 9

hearing in this docket on October 24th and 25th, 2022. That could be something for the parties to consider if that would work with the schedule as a possibility, but I would have to confirm that works for the Commission.

I also want to note that the Commission was interested in having the Company file a crosswalk before the hearing in this docket that addressed and reconciled this Commission's findings in general rate case final order with the testimony of filings in the CEIP docket.

I did not see that addressed specifically in the emails. Were there any concerns from the Company with -- with such a suggestion?

MS. BARNETT: Thank you, Your Honor. No concerns theor- -- you know, theoretically with it. It's just I don't think it's going to be as useful or helpful as -- as we think.

I don't think there's going to be much from the rate case that we're going to be able to use in the CEIP coming out of that. And I think it would kind of artificially have some expectation around it that I don't think is going to be realized.

So we don't see that it's going to be a benefit in this case to put something on the schedule to be waiting for something that probably won't be as helpful as some people think.

1 issues in this case in -- in any way.

MS. SUETAKE: Thank you for that explanation. I would personally find it useful, and I think all the parties wouldn't object to that. I mean, if there are no -- it turns out there are no findings, that makes sense that they wouldn't have to file something, but I think we should just leave that up until the time.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would any other party like to comment on that particular issue?

MS. GOODIN: Judge Howard, this is Amanda Goodin, with Earthjustice. I -- I would just flag, I believe in your email you mentioned the possibility of having the RFP rules incorporated as part of this crosswalk, and I know the Company has said they will not be able to do that. I believe in the rate case, they've noted that they plan to file a power cost adjustment or power cost case that incorporate those results.

So to the extent that some of the hearing date is driven by a desire to wait for that, we think that it doesn't make sense to wait for something that's going to be the subject of a separate case and that we won't have likely anyways.

JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. I think that --

Page 10

JUDGE HOWARD: That's a fair point to consider.

Would any other party like to speak to this issue?

MS. SUETAKE: This is Nina Suetake from Public Counsel Unit. I guess I'm not entirely sure what you mean by a "crosswalk." Do you just mean what parts in the decision would affect the CEIP? If you could give an explanation, that'd be helpful.

JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. And we have -- we have done this in some past cases. It's not something that we do on a regular basis. But it would be asking the Company -- or directing the Company in the schedule to file this crosswalk document, showing how the various findings in the general rate case order that are relevant to the CEIP docket have -- have been accounted for or how they impact the testimony that's been offered so far in this case.

So as Barnett just offered, there -there -- there -- there may be a number of findings in
the general rate case that do not directly apply to the
CEIP docket, but we still do believe it could be helpful
in case there are findings in the general rate case
final order that impact things like the interim targets
or the customer benefit indicators or any of the other

Page 12

Page 11

that does -- that does raise the other issue of incorporating the RFP results in the CEIP docket. Our suggestion for the crosswalk was not specifically concerned with the RFP results, and -- and the timing that we're proposing for the evidentiary hearing is not tied to the RFP results.

But I imagine it could be helpful to this proceeding to incorporate them, but I did receive Barnett's email, explaining that that might not be feasible due to the timing.

Would any other party like to comment on the issue of incorporating the RFP results, because otherwise, it seems that we're kind of setting that suggestion aside, as far as incorporating it in this docket?

All right. Hearing none, I -- those were my comments and suggestions for the parties to consider.

Have the parties -- since the email exchange, have the parties agreed and conferred on a schedule or would it be helpful to go off the record and the parties confer amongst themselves?

MS. BARNETT: Your Honor, I don't have any objection to going off the record and conferring. We have, though, talked informally with the parties for several weeks and months regarding a schedule for the

Page 13

CEIP and getting that resolved. So I don't think it would be beneficial to go off the record this time.

1 2

I think it's better that -- you know, we've proposed a schedule that -- and Staff has proposed a general -- a schedule with some general dates. So I don't know if we're going to be able to get much closer than that.

I would, again, like to just go back to any idea of -- we do still have the appeal for the consolidation order pending. And so any links to the general rate case, I'd like to -- you know, right now they are separated, of course.

And so regarding any schedule that links the CEIP to the rate case, I'd like to, you know, again caution that, that I don't want to get into the -- get into the CEIP schedule and have people just say, well, we don't -- we're not ready to talk about that. We're not ready to settle because we want to wait and see what happens in the rate case.

So that's kind of PSE's concerns and why we've proposed a schedule that ends the CEIP by the end of the year, which is extremely important to PSE.

And so with that, I don't know what -- what more we're going to be able to -- what resolution we're going to be able to reach if we just go off the record

Page 15

MR. CALLAGHAN: Okay. Yes, Your Honor. So Staff, I was able to speak with Ms. Barnett, but I haven't been able to speak to the other stakeholders. So I believe it would be helpful to go offline briefly and discuss.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Does any other party want to raise any concerns before we go off the record for a break for the parties to discuss this issue amongst themselves?

All right. I'm not hearing any concerns. Let's go off the record. We are off the record.

12 (A break was taken from 13 9:47 a.m. to 10:40 a.m.)

JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on record. We're coming back after a brief break -- recess for the parties to discuss the schedule.

As I understand, Staff has a proposed schedule, but there wasn't complete agreement from the parties.

So, Mr. Callaghan, would you like to present Staff's proposed schedule and describe the support as it is for the schedule from the other parties?

MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. I will do my best.

So after discussion with the other parties,

Page 14

right now, but I'm certainly happy to.

JUDGE HOWARD: Well, I can appreciate that there are different -- there are competing interests at stake. This isn't an easy question to answer, and the Company is seeking review of that order denying consolidation.

I don't -- I don't think it's an easy issue, and it's -- it's not -- it's not a decision I'm making lightly by recommending the hearing date be later, as I am right now.

But with all that in mind, Staff did propose a procedural schedule over email. It looked like there were -- it was more of an outline of a schedule, and some of the dates need to be filled in.

I would turn to Staff. Would it be helpful for you to go off the record and discuss this with the other parties and at least have -- see if you can have some of the parties join you in proposing that?

MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. I believe that it would. I just wanted to get confirmation before we go off the record, though, that the schedule that you're looking for is one that incorporates the January 31st evidentiary hearing date; is that correct?

JUDGE HOWARD: That's right.

Page 16

Staff is recommending a first settlement conference on June 23rd in the afternoon; a second settlement conference on August 16th; response testimony, a date of Monday, October 10th.

Your Honor, you did mention the possibility of having a settlement conference hearing date of October 24th and 25th. If that is possible, Staff would support saving that date in case we do reach settlement.

Staff would recommend rebuttal and cross-answering testimony due December 12th, and as you mentioned, Your Honor, an evidentiary hearing January 31st.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. The deadline for rebuttal and cross-answering testimony, that was December 12th?

MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes, Your Honor.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. So I am aware that the Company has proposed its own schedule, and I have received that by email. I think after this prehearing conference today, I'm going to take a careful look at both what Staff is proposing, what the Company is proposing, and what the positions of any of the other parties are. So I will consider that when I enter the order.

But for now, Ms. Barnett, is there anything

you would like to address specifically with Staff's 1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you, Your Honor. 2 JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.

And could I hear from NWEC and Front and Centered?

So thank you for your consideration of that. We do support a settlement hearing earlier in twenty -before the end of the year, and would just like to remind everyone, I guess, that the CEIP has already been open for five months. So when we're talking about specific settlement dates, it has been some significant time that people have already been reviewing this

MS. BARNETT: Nothing in -- no, Your Honor.

We simply didn't really engage in the discussions around

Staff's proposal because PSE just can't support a

schedule that extends into 2023.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

proposal?

MS. GOODIN: Your Honor, Amanda Goodin, with -- appearing on behalf of Front and Centered and NWEC. You know, as I think we've put forward already, we support a shorter schedule along the lines of what PSE has proposed. We think that waiting to resolve this until

proposal. So with that, nothing further. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. a year and a half into the implementation period for the four-year plan will significantly prejudice our ability to influence the contents of the plan, which, of course, is the whole point of being able to challenge it via adjudication.

Could I hear from Public Counsel if Public Counsel has any specific concerns or thoughts?

We did discuss dates with the other parties on Staff's schedule. We do agree and are available for both of these settlement conference proposed dates, the June 23rd and August 16th.

MS. SUETAKE: Thank you, Your Honor. This is Nina Suetake, for Public Counsel Unit. We support Staff's proposed schedule. The schedule takes into consideration the significant staffing, time constraints that are happening this year with the two GRCs on top of each other, as well as a large Telecom proceeding that is happening.

For response testimony, even if -- even if the Commission decides to schedule an evidentiary hearing in late January, early February, as I believe we suggested, we still see value in an earlier response testimony deadline. We would prefer a late August response testimony date even if the evidentiary hearing

Page 18

Page 20

Page 19

So we would prefer to keep these dates, understanding that if PSE's consolidation motion or petition for rehearing of that request is granted and that we'd have to redo the schedule anyway.

So given the requirements of what we have right now, this is what we would support.

> JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could I have AWEC's position?

MS. MOSER: Yes, Your Honor. Sommer Moser, on behalf of AWEC. We support PSE's schedule. We find value in an earlier resolution of this CEIP.

With that said, we did engage in dates. In Staff's proposed schedule, they all work for AWEC. So there's not a scheduling conflict. But, again, just support earlier resolution through PSE's schedule to the extent that an earlier hearing date could be accommodated.

> JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Could I hear from The Energy Project?

MR. FFITCH: Thank you, Your Honor. Given the desires expressed from the Bench about the schedule, we support -- or we have no objection to the general outline that's been put forward by Staff. Not every single date in the schedule works for us, but we will work around the final schedule issued by the Bench.

is pushed into 2023.

We also support the October 24th, 25th settlement hearing, scheduling that in case we're able to resolve anything.

And I know, for cross-answering testimony, I believe the parties also said they would be available for a deadline week of November 14th if the Commission decides on an earlier response testimony date, which is -- which is something we were not all able to agree to.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. And could I hear from Renewable Northwest? MS. WARE: Yes. Katie Ware, on behalf of Renewable Northwest. We participated in the discussion around scheduling conflicts. None of those hard conflicts are ours, so we're comfortable with the outline Nash provided or the more expedited timeline that some of the parties are hoping for. So we will accommodate either way.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. One issue that occurs to me right now is that the Company's proposed schedule included dates for submissions for intervenor funding. And I don't believe that Staff's proposed schedule provides for those same dates.

5 (Pages 17 to 20)

Page 21

And under the interim agreement that the Commission has approved, normally the request for case certification and notices of intent to seek funding would be due at the prehearing conference or another date that the Commission sets.

So if -- if we were going to have those submissions in this case, I would likely address that in this prehearing conference order.

Do any of the intervenors intend to seek this funding in this case?

MS. GOODIN: Front and Centered does, Your Honor. I am not sure about the Energy Coalition. I will have to double check. But I know Front and Centered does.

MS. MOSER: Sommer Moser, for AWEC. I think we're comfortable with whatever dates are set per your prehearing conference memorandum. I don't think we anticipate there to be funding available after the rate case request for the customers representation trust fund.

To the extent there is, I think we'll evaluate seeking funding at that time. But I think, without knowing where funding in the rate case is going to land, it's a little difficult to say what we will seek or may seek here.

JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. I think that's a fair point.

Page 23

So I'm going to move on to a couple of other issues that are related to the procedural schedule. And as I said, I will take all of this under consideration when I am writing this order following our conference today.

Turning to the issue of discovery, I want to be -- I want to caution the parties be judicious in their use of discovery. This is a case involving a new type of filing, which overlaps in some respects with the pending general rate case.

Discovery may not be used as a fishing expedition. If the parties have a discovery dispute, they should attempt to work those out. But if they cannot, they should bring any motions to the Commission for resolution.

I also want to address some specific issues regarding discovery. I don't believe that this was addressed in either of the proposed schedules from either the Company or Staff. But would the parties have any objection to identifying each data request by topic? Would that be helpful? Would that not be helpful?

MR. CALLAGHAN: Staff believes that that would be helpful. That's a common practice that we've

Page 22

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Was the court reporter able to catch that? It was a little quiet.

THE COURT REPORTER: Yes, I heard it. Thank you.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
Would any other party like to address the
issue of intervenor funding? And I recognize AWEC's
comment that we're not certain what the outcome is of
the proposed budgets and the amounts approved by the
Commission in the other docket. So this might be
something too that requires some evaluation later by the
parties. But would anyone else like to address this
issue?

MS. GOODIN: I guess I would just flag that, you know, there are parties, and, you know, Front and Centered has signaled its intent to seek funding in this docket and did signal that intent in their submission in the rate case as well, which is guite modest.

the rate case as well, which is quite modest.

And I would hope the Commission would take that into account in making decisions in that docket, you know, assuming the Commission keeps these separate, you know, to not -- to not let this docket go begging just because the timeline for the rate case is more accelerated.

Page 24

implemented in -- in GRCs in recent years.
 MS. SUETAKE: Public Counsel has no objection.

MR. FFITCH: Any support staff is a very helpful practice.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I would -- I would intend to include that requirement in the prehearing conference order in that case, unless there are any further -- any other party would like to indicate an objection to that.

All right. Hearing none.

And, again, I don't believe that this was addressed in the proposed schedule, but would the parties want to shorten the response time for data requests after a certain point in the proceeding?

I would turn first to the Company for -- for their proposed schedule.

MS. BARNETT: We have no objection to shortening it in -- along the lines as with a general rate case. We're used to that. So no objection here.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I would turn to Staff.

MR. CALLAGHAN: No objection, Your Honor.
JUDGE HOWARD: Would any other party have any concerns or objections to that proposal?

Page 25 Page 27 1 that will be memorialized in the prehearing conference 1 All right. Hearing none. 2 2 And we also commonly include a requirement 3 that the parties -- that any data requests and responses 3 Also, the Commission's rules provide for are shared with every other party to the proceeding, and 4 4 electronic service of documents. The Commission will 5 5 we would include such a requirement in the prehearing serve the parties electronically and the parties will 6 conference order. 6 serve each other electronically. 7 Is there any objection from any of the 7 If any party has not yet designated a lead 8 parties to including such a requirement in this order? 8 representative for service, please do so via an email to 9 9 MS. BARNETT: No objection. me as soon as possible. My email is JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. 10 10 Michael.Howard@utc.wa.gov. Hearing no objections, I would plan to include that. 11 Also, if anyone would like to add names and 11 I did note that there does not appear to be 12 email addresses of other representatives or support 12 a protective order in this docket. Am I correct with staff who should receive electronic courtesy copies of 13 13 14 that, Ms. Barnett? 14 all documents filed in this proceeding, please email 15 MS. BARNETT: That's correct. We haven't 15 that to us as well. 16 moved for that, but probably appropriate for a standard 16 And finally, there is the issue of errata 17 protective order. 17 sheets. And I am not certain if that was addressed in 18 JUDGE HOWARD: Will the -- does the Company 18 the proposed schedule from either the Company or Staff. 19 intend to move for that? 19 We typically set this for a week prior to the 20 MS. BARNETT: I hadn't -- we hadn't 20 evidentiary hearing. discussed that, honestly, but the -- but I do probably 21 Are there any objections to including such a 21 requirement in this prehearing conference order? 22 anticipate there will be confidential information 22 requested. So I move -- I think it's appropriate we MR. CALLAGHAN: No objection, Your Honor. 23 23 24 move for that now. 24 MS. BARNETT: None from the Company. 25 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I would take that 25 MS. SUETAKE: None from Public Counsel. Page 26 Page 28 as your oral motion for a protective order. 1 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Hearing no 1 2 MS. BARNETT: Yeah. 2 objections, I will plan on including such a requirement. 3 3 JUDGE HOWARD: And I -- are there any Is there anything else that we should address today before we adjourn? 4 responses from any of the parties? 4 5 MR. CALLAGHAN: No objection from Staff, 5 MS. BARNETT: I would like to add, I think 6 6 we've asked for it in the notice of appearance, but if Your Honor. MS. SUETAKE: No objection from Public 7 7 you could add PSEDRS@perkinscoie.com for a courtesy 8 8 service, I would appreciate that. But nothing further Counsel. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. I 9 9 from PSE. 10 would grant PSE's motion for a protective order. And I 10 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. And I have made a note of that courtesy service address. am construing that as simply requesting a protective 11 11 12 order with our normal protections for confidential 12 MS. BARNETT: Thank you. 13 13 JUDGE HOWARD: Anything else from any of the information; is that correct? MS. BARNETT: Correct, yeah. Standard parties that we should address? 14 14 protective will be fine. If we find we are requesting MS. GOODIN: Your Honor, I neglected to 15 15 highly confidential, we will move for a protective order 16 raise this with the other parties in our informal 16 17 for highly protective provisions at that time. 17 discussion, and that was my oversight, but I don't JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Okay. I just 18 18 believe we have a date for a public comment hearing as 19 have a few minor issues to touch on before we adjourn 19 part of the proposed schedule. And we do feel strongly 20 today. 20 that there be at least one, and perhaps two public 21 So in terms of electronic filing and 21 comment hearings. Perhaps one in the evening and one 22 electronic service, the Commission requires electronic 22 during the day. 23 filing of documents for formal filing. We are 23 We are happy to discuss offline dates that 24 continuing to suspend the requirements for paper copies 24 would work for that, but we feel that is an important 25 and documents in light of the COVID-19 pandemic, and 25 part of the schedule.

Page 29

JUDGE HOWARD: I agree and -- that there should be a public comment hearing in this case. I did see that in Staff's proposed schedule, it's a to be determined date, and we frequently will note that so that Public Counsel and Staff and the other parties work out a public comment hearing date and they schedule that with the -- based on the Commissioners' availability.

Were there -- I believe there was a concern -- in Front and Centered's earlier comments, I believe there was a concern that it should be held sometime in the summer; am I right?

MS. GOODIN: Your Honor, that was when we were still looking at the possibility of consolidation. I don't think that we are wed to a specific date, but we want to make sure we -- that it happens early enough for parties and for the Commission to have the positions informed by -- by that hearing.

And I would just also note for the Commission and for other parties, we do plan to ask PSE to consult with its advisory groups, especially including its Equity Advisory Group, on any significant settlement proposal or developments in this docket, given their major role in the development of the CEIP.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I will have to consider that last point. I'm not sure if that's within

help define these, and we don't -- we would like to see them consult with that committee before kind of finalizing any significant change in direction that would implicate work that they did on this document.

So we don't have a fully fleshed out proposal for what that would look like, and we do understand the confidentiality constraints. And I don't think we were envisioning having the entire advisory committee be part of the negotiation process, for example, but we would like to talk with the Company and other parties about how to make that possible.

JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Barnett, would you like to respond to that?

MS. BARNETT: No, I support having those discussions and -- in line with the confidentiality rules. And PSE has been keeping the EAG up to date so far. So I'm sure we don't have any objection to continuing that within the -- everyone's expectations and understanding.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you all. I think that in terms of -- I'm -- I may not include that as any sort of instruction or requirement in the prehearing conference order, but it does sound that that is the Company's practice at the present time, and they do have to -- I imagine that there is some balancing of

Page 30

the scope of my prehearing conference order, but that is -- that is a valid point to consider.

Ms. Suetake, would you like to address anything about the public comment hearing?

MS. SUETAKE: Yes, Your Honor. I agree with -- with counsel for NWEC and Front and Centered that we should have public comment hearings. I guess I'm open to just leaving it TBD for now, to give us more time off the record to determine what date would be best for everybody. And we'd also support having a daytime hearing if the parties think that that would be more helpful to people actually intervening.

Also, with regard to settlement, sharing with the EAG, I was curious if -- if counsel intended it to be part of the negotiation of settlement or once the settlement has been reached because there are settlement confidentiality rules. And so I was kind of hoping for some clarification there.

MS. GOODIN: Yes, thank you. We understand there are confidentiality constraints that we would all have to take into consideration. I guess our -- our main feeling is that, you know, it's the first major document to implement equity mandates that are new under Washington law.

PSE did turn to an advisory committee to

Page 32

Page 31

these concerns with the confidentiality of negotiations.

Is there anything else we should address

Is there anything else we should address before we adjourn?

MS. SUETAKE: Your Honor, this is Nina Suetake from Public Counsel Unit. I -- I am concerned about not putting that in an order because it would be new to have settlement -- items that have been discussed in settlement, you know, disclosed to additional parties. I feel like that we should be given guidance in the form of the order there.

I do not object to sharing that sort of information with the Equity Advisory Group. I think that's a good idea. I just want to make sure that the actual content of negotiations or -- because none of those settlements are final until they are filed. They all constitute negotiation positions up until the point they're filed. So I think it would be more helpful to have that in an order.

MS. BARNETT: And, Your Honor, I think this is probably opening it up to I think more than -- than we anticipated to discuss at the prehearing conference. I think, to the extent that the parties have differing understandings of what is going to be confidential for settlement and what isn't, that this -- this probably be not put on the -- in the order.

CERTIFICATE
WASHINGTON
F THURSTON
r Garlinghouse, a Certified Shorthand
and for the State of Washington, do hereby
ne foregoing transcript is true and
the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.
NO.
, with
Total Control of the
Jayler Graninghouse.
Tayler Garlinghouse, CCR 3358

	allowing 33:20	7:11 18:10,13	C 2:1 3:1 4:4 35:1,1	closer 13:6
a.m 1:14 4:2 15:13	Amanda 3:3 6:17	21:15	calendar 8:17	co-presiding 4:15
15:13 34:7	11:12 19:5	AWEC's 18:8 22:8	call 4:19 7:3	Coalition 6:18
ability 19:12 35:9	amounts 22:10		Callaghan 2:6 5:18	21:12
able 5:8 9:18 11:17	answer 14:4	B	5:19 7:16 14:19	Coie 2:12 5:14
13:6,24,25 15:2,3	anticipate 21:18	back 13:8 15:14,15	15:1,20,23 16:16	comfortable 20:16
19:14 20:3,9 22:2	25:22	Bainbridge 2:23	23:24 24:23 26:5	21:16
accelerated 22:25	anticipated 32:21	balancing 31:25	27:23	coming 9:19 15:15
acceptable 8:22	anyway 18:4	Barnett 2:11 5:12	captioned 4:8	comment 5:6,7
accommodate	anyways 11:24	5:13 9:13 10:19	careful 16:20	11:10 12:11 22:9
20:19	appeal 13:9	12:22 15:2 16:25	Carson 2:11 5:15	28:18,21 29:2,6
accommodated	appear 25:12	17:3 24:18 25:9	case 4:8,22 9:8,18	30:4,7 33:2 34:1
18:17	appearance 5:17	25:14,15,20 26:2	9:23 10:15,18,21	comments 5:3,4,4
account 22:21	5:22 6:3,9,14,22	26:14 27:24 28:5	10:23,23 11:1,17	12:17 29:9
accounted 10:16	7:4 28:6	28:12 31:12,14	11:19,23 13:11,14	Commission 1:2,16
accurate 35:9	appearances 5:10	32:19	13:19 16:8 20:3	2:5 4:14 5:20 8:4
actual 32:14	appearing 6:6,17	Barnett's 12:9	21:2,7,10,19,23	8:13 9:4,5 19:21
add 27:11 28:5,7	6:24 19:6	based 29:7	22:19,24 23:10,12	20:7 21:2,5 22:11
additional 32:8	apply 10:21	basis 10:12	24:8,20 29:2 34:5	22:20,22 23:16
address 17:1 21:7	appreciate 14:2	begging 22:23	cases 8:13,20,24	26:22 27:4 29:16
22:7,13 23:18	28:8	beginning 5:10	10:11	29:19
28:4,11,14 30:3	appropriate 25:16	behalf 5:19 6:7,12	catch 22:2	Commission's 5:5
32:2 33:24,25	25:23	6:17,25 18:10	caution 13:15 23:9	9:8 27:3
addressed 9:7,10	approved 21:2	19:6 20:13	CCR 1:20 35:14	Commissioners
23:20 24:13 27:17	22:10	believe 8:21 10:22	CEIP 4:12 9:9,19	4:16,16 5:7
addresses 27:12	artificially 9:20	11:14,17 14:20	10:8,16,22 12:2	Commissioners'
addressing 7:24	aside 12:14	15:4 19:22 20:6	13:1,14,16,21	29:7
adjourn 26:19 28:4	asked 28:6	20:23 23:19 24:12	17:10 18:11 29:23	committee 30:25
32:3 34:2	asking 10:12	28:18 29:8,10	Centered 3:2 6:15	31:2,9
adjourned 34:6,7	Assistant 2:7 5:19	believes 23:24	6:18 7:12,13 19:4	common 23:25
adjudication 19:15	5:25	Bellevue 2:13	19:6 21:11,14	commonly 25:2
adjudicatory 4:11	assuming 22:22	Bench 18:21,25	22:17 30:6	Company 4:22 9:6
adjustment 11:18	attempt 23:15	beneficial 13:2	Centered's 29:9	9:11 10:13,13
administrative	attend 5:5	benefit 9:23 10:25	certain 22:9 24:15	11:16 14:5 16:18
1:11 2:2 4:14	Attorney 2:7,17,22	best 15:24 30:9	27:17	16:21 23:21 24:16
advisory 29:20,21	5:19,25	35:9	certainly 14:1 33:2	25:18 27:18,24
30:25 31:8 32:12	August 16:3 19:19	better 13:3	certification 21:3	31:10
affect 10:8	19:24	Box 2:7	Certified 35:6	Company's 20:22
afternoon 16:2	availability 29:7	break 15:8,12,15 brief 15:15	certify 35:8	31:24
agree 19:17 20:9	available 19:17		challenge 19:14	competing 14:3
29:1 30:5	20:6 21:18	briefly 15:4	change 31:3	complete 15:18
agreed 12:19	Avenue 1:22 2:18	bring 23:16 budgets 22:10	check 21:13	concern 29:9,10
agreement 15:18	3:4,13	Buell 1:21	clarification 30:18	33:11
21:1	aware 16:17	Duen 1.21	Clean 1:6 4:9,12	concerned 12:4
Alliance 6:4	AWEC 3:6 6:3,7	$\overline{\mathbf{C}}$	Cleve 3:8 6:6	32:5 33:9

	ı	1	1	
concerns 9:11,14	25:15 26:13,14	dbarnett@perki	25:13 29:22	32:12 33:18
13:20 15:7,10	cost 11:18,19	2:14	document 10:14	errata 27:16
17:18 24:25 32:1	counsel 2:16,18	deadline 16:14	30:23 31:4 33:3	especially 29:20
confer 12:21	4:23 5:23 6:1	19:24 20:7	documents 26:23	evaluate 21:22
conference 1:9 4:7	7:13 10:6 17:17	December 16:10,15	26:25 27:4,14	evaluation 22:12
4:17,20 7:24 8:2	17:18,20 24:2	decides 19:21 20:8	Donna 2:11 5:12	evening 28:21
16:1,3,6,20 19:18	26:8 27:25 29:5	decision 10:8 14:8	double 21:13	everybody 30:10
21:4,8,17 23:6	30:6,14 32:5	decisions 22:21	driven 11:21	everyone's 31:18
24:8 25:6 27:1,22	Counsel's 33:11,21	define 31:1	due 12:10 16:10	evidentiary 8:18
30:1 31:23 32:21	countervailing	denying 14:5	21:4	12:5 14:23 16:11
conferred 12:19	33:19	describe 15:21		19:21,25 27:20
conferring 12:23	COUNTY 35:4	describing 33:12	E	example 31:10
confidential 25:22	couple 8:8 23:3	designated 27:7	E 2:1,1 3:1,1 4:4,4	exchange 12:19
26:12,16 32:23	course 13:12 19:13	desire 11:21	35:1,1	expectation 9:20
confidentiality	court 4:25 22:2,4	desires 18:21	EAG 30:14 31:16	expectations 31:18
30:17,20 31:7,15	courtesy 27:13 28:7	determine 30:9	33:4,8,13	expedited 20:17
32:1 33:14	28:11	determined 29:4	earlier 8:17 17:8	expedition 23:14
confirm 9:4	COVID-19 26:25	development 29:23	18:11,15,16 19:23	explain 4:19
confirmation 14:21	cross-answering	developments	20:8 29:9	explaining 12:9
conflict 18:14	16:10,14 20:5	29:22	early 19:22 29:15	explanation 5:9
conflicts 20:15,16	crosswalk 9:6 10:7	different 14:3	Earthjustice 3:4	10:9 11:3
consider 5:8 9:2	10:14 11:16 12:3	differing 32:22	6:17,19 11:13	expressed 18:21
10:2 12:17 16:23	curious 30:14	difficult 8:22 21:24	easy 14:4,7	extends 17:6
29:25 30:2	customer 10:25	directing 10:13	either 20:19 23:20	extent 11:20 18:16
consideration 17:7	customers 21:19	direction 31:3	23:21 27:18	21:21 32:22 33:7
17:22 23:5 30:21		directly 10:21	electronic 26:21,22	extremely 13:22
33:23	D	disclosed 32:8	26:22 27:4,13	
consolidation	D 4:4	discovery 23:8,10	electronically 27:5	F
13:10 14:6 18:2	D3 2:23	23:13,14,19	27:6	F 35:1
29:13	data 23:22 24:14	discuss 8:9 14:16	email 8:8 11:14	fair 10:1 23:2
constitute 32:16	25:3	15:5,8,16 19:16	12:9,18 14:12	far 7:8,23 10:18
constraints 8:12	date 8:23 11:21	28:23 32:21	16:19 27:8,9,12	12:14 31:17 33:1
17:22 30:20 31:7	14:9,23 16:3,6,8	discussed 25:21	27:14	feasible 12:10
construing 26:11	18:16,24 19:25	32:7	emailed 8:3	February 8:6 19:22
consult 29:20 31:2	20:8 21:5 28:18	discussing 4:25	emails 9:11	feel 28:19,24 32:9
Consumers 6:4	29:4,6,14 30:9	discussion 15:25	ends 13:21	feeling 30:22
Cont 3:1	31:16	20:14 28:17	Energy 1:5,6 2:10	ffitch 2:22 6:11,12
containing 34:4	dates 8:3,12 13:5	discussions 17:4	2:21 4:9,9,12 5:11	18:20 24:4
content 32:14	14:14 17:12 18:1	31:15 33:8	5:14 6:4,9,12,18	Fifth 2:18
contents 19:13	18:12 19:16,18	disposition 34:5	7:11 18:19 21:12	file 5:4 9:6 10:14
continuing 26:24	20:22,25 21:16	dispute 23:14	engage 17:4 18:12	11:6,18
31:18	28:23	docket 1:4 4:8 7:8	enter 16:23	filed 7:7,23 27:14
conversations 33:4	Davison 3:8 6:6	7:23 8:21 9:1,7,9	entire 31:8	32:15,17
copies 26:24 27:13	day 28:22	10:16,22 12:2,15	entirely 10:6	filing 23:11 26:21
correct 14:24 25:13	days 8:5,8	22:11,18,21,23	envisioning 31:8	26:23,23
	daytime 30:10		equity 29:21 30:23	filings 9:9
	l -	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	l -

filled 14:14	General's 2:17	heard 22:4	24:21,24 25:10,18	22:18
final 9:8 10:24	getting 13:1	hearing 5:3,6,7 7:5	25:25 26:3,9,18	interested 4:18 9:6
18:25 32:15	give 7:3 10:9 30:8	7:9,21,21 8:4,5,12	28:1,10,13 29:1	
	33:23		' '	interesting 33:25 interests 14:3 33:17
finalizing 31:3		8:16,18,23 9:1,7	29:24 31:12,20	33:19
finally 27:16	given 8:12 18:5,20	11:20 12:5,16	33:10	
find 8:22 11:3	29:23 32:9	14:9,23 15:10	T	interim 10:24 21:1
18:10 26:15	go 12:20 13:2,8,25	16:6,11 17:8	idea 13:9 32:13	intervene 7:10,23
findings 9:8 10:15	14:16,21 15:4,7	18:16 19:22,25	identifying 23:22	intervening 30:12
10:20,23 11:5	15:11 22:23 33:4	20:3 24:11 25:1	imagine 12:7 31:25	intervenor 20:23
fine 26:15	33:9	25:11 27:20 28:1	impact 10:17,24	22:8
first 4:12 16:1	going 9:15,17,18,21	28:18 29:2,6,17	implement 30:23	intervenors 4:23
24:16 30:22	9:22 11:23 12:23	30:4,11 33:2 34:3	implementation	21:9
fishing 23:13	13:6,24,25 16:20	hearings 28:21	1:6 4:9,12 19:11	intervention 7:6,7
five 7:10 17:11	21:6,23 23:3	30:7	implemented 24:1	7:15
flag 11:13 22:15	32:23 33:4,21,23	held 29:10	implicate 31:4	involving 23:10
fleshed 31:5	good 4:6 5:24 6:5	help 31:1	_	Island 2:23
following 7:10 23:6	6:11,16 32:13	helpful 9:16,25	implicates 33:13 important 13:22	issue 8:1 10:4 11:11
foregoing 35:8	Goodin 3:3 6:16,17	10:9,22 12:7,20	28:24	12:1,12 14:7 15:8
form 32:10	11:12,13 19:5,5	14:15 15:4 23:23		20:21 22:8,14
formal 26:23	21:11 22:15 28:15	23:23,25 24:5	include 4:22 24:7	23:8 27:16 33:25
forward 18:23 19:7	29:12 30:19	30:12 32:17	25:2,5,11 31:21	34:3
four 7:10	grant 26:10	High 2:23	included 20:22	issued 18:25
four-year 19:12	granted 18:3	highly 26:16,17	including 25:8 27:21 28:2 29:21	issues 4:25 11:1
Fourth 1:22 2:12	granting 7:22	hold 8:4,25		23:4,18 26:19
frequently 29:4	GRCs 17:23 24:1	honestly 25:21	incorporate 11:19 12:8	33:18
Front 3:2 6:15,18	Group 29:21 32:12	Honor 5:12,18,24	· -	items 32:7
7:12,12 19:3,6	groups 29:20	6:5,11,16 7:17	incorporated 11:15	$oxed{J}$
21:11,13 22:16	guess 10:6 17:10	9:13 12:22 14:19	incorporates 14:23	
29:9 30:6	22:15 30:7,21	15:1,23 16:5,11	incorporating 12:2 12:12,14	January 8:5 14:23 16:12 19:22
fully 31:5	33:6	16:16 17:3,19	indicate 7:19 24:10	
fund 21:20	guidance 32:9	18:9,20 19:1,5	indicated 8:4	join 14:18 joining 4:16
funding 20:23 21:3	33:22	21:12 24:23 26:6	indicators 10:25	•
21:10,18,22,23	guidelines 34:5	27:23 28:15 29:12	influence 19:13	judge 1:11 2:2 4:6 4:14 5:16,21 6:2,8
22:8,17	H	30:5 32:4,19	informal 28:16	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
further 7:24 17:15	half 19:11	hope 22:20	informally 12:24	6:13,21 7:1,18
24:9 28:8 34:3	han 19.11 happening 17:23	hoping 20:18 30:17	information 25:22	10:1,10 11:9,12 11:25 14:2,25
G	17:25	Howard 1:11 2:3	26:13 32:12 33:1	15:6,14 16:13,17
G4:4	happens 13:19	4:6,13 5:16,21 6:2	33:7,12	17:16 18:7,18
	29:15	6:8,13,21 7:1,18	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	19:2 20:11,20
Garlinghouse 1:20		10:1,10 11:9,12	informed 29:17	,
35:6,14	happy 14:1 28:23 Harbor 3:8	11:25 14:2,25	input 33:18	22:1,6 23:1 24:6
general 2:7 5:19,25		15:6,14 16:13,17	instruction 31:22	24:21,24 25:10,18
8:13,23 9:8 10:15	hard 20:15	17:16 18:7,18	intend 21:9 24:7	25:25 26:3,9,18
10:21,23 13:5,5	he/him 5:20	19:2 20:11,20	25:19	28:1,10,13 29:1
13:11 18:22 23:12	hear 17:17 18:19	22:1,6 23:1 24:6	intended 5:2 30:14	29:24 31:12,20
24:19	19:3 20:12		intent 21:3 22:17	33:10

				1 age 55
judicious 23:9	Loop 1:16	names 27:11	objections 7:14,16	8:7,9,11,15 9:2
June 16:2 19:19		Nash 2:6 5:18	24:25 25:11 27:21	11:4 12:17,18,19
June 10.2 17.17	M	20:17	28:2	12:21,24 14:17,18
K	main 30:22	nash.callaghan@	occurs 20:21	15:8,16,19,22,25
Katie 3:12 6:24	major 29:23 30:22	2:9	October 9:1 16:4,7	16:23 19:16 20:6
20:13	making 14:8 22:21	National 1:24	20:2	20:18 22:13,16
katie@renewabl	mandates 30:23	NE 2:23	offered 10:17,19	23:9,14,21 24:14
3:15	matter 1:4 4:9,15	necessarily 5:2	Office 2:17	25:3,8 26:4 27:5,5
keep 8:11 18:1	mean 10:7,7 11:4	need 8:9 14:14	offline 15:4 28:23	28:14,16 29:5,16
keeping 31:16	33:16	neglected 28:15	Okay 15:1 26:18	29:19 30:11 31:11
keeps 22:22	meeting 4:21 5:2	negotiation 30:15	Olympia 1:23 2:8	32:9,22
kind 9:19 12:13	members 4:18	31:9 32:16 33:20	once 30:15	parts 10:7
13:20 30:17 31:2	33:13	negotiations 32:1	ones 7:7	party 7:19 10:3
know 9:14 11:16	memorandum	32:14 33:14	open 17:11 30:8	11:10 12:11 15:7
13:3,6,11,14,23	21:17	new 23:10 30:23	opening 32:20	22:7 24:9,24 25:4
19:7 20:5 21:13	memorialized 27:1	32:7	oral 26:1	27:7
22:16,16,22,23	mention 16:5	Nina 2:17 5:25 10:5	order 7:25 9:9	pending 8:13,24
30:22 32:8 33:6,8	mentioned 8:24	17:20 32:4	10:15,24 13:10	13:10 23:12
knowing 21:23	11:14 16:11	nina.suetake@at	14:5 16:24 21:8	people 9:25 13:16
knowledge 35:9	Michael 1:11 2:3	2:20	23:6 24:8 25:6,8	17:13 30:12
	4:13	normal 8:17 26:12	25:13,17 26:1,10	period 19:11
<u>L</u>	Michael.Howard	normally 21:2	26:12,16 27:2,22	Perkins 2:12 5:13
Lacey 1:17 4:1	27:10	Northeast 2:12	30:1 31:23 32:6	personally 11:3
land 21:24	mind 5:9 8:12	Northwest 3:11,13	32:10,18,25 33:22	petition 18:3
large 17:24	14:11	6:18,23,25 7:12	34:4	petitions 7:6,6,10
late 19:22,24	minor 26:19	20:12,14	Oregon 3:9,14	7:15,22
law 1:11 2:2,22	modest 22:19	note 8:15 9:5 25:12	organizations 7:2	plan 1:6 4:10,12
4:14 30:24	Molly 6:19	28:11 29:4,18	7:11	11:18 19:12,13
lead 27:7	moment 8:22	noted 11:18	outcome 22:9	25:11 28:2 29:19
leave 11:7	Monday 16:4	notice 7:3 28:6	outline 14:13 18:23	planning 4:24
leaving 30:8	months 5:6 12:25	notices 21:3	20:17	please 27:8,14
let's 4:6 5:9 7:5	17:11	November 20:7	overlaps 23:11	PO 2:7
15:11,14	morning 4:7 5:24	number 10:20	oversight 28:17	point 10:1 19:14
light 26:25 33:5	6:5,11,16	NWEC 3:2 6:14		23:2 24:15 29:25
lightly 14:9	Moser 3:7 6:5,6	7:12,12 19:3,7	P	30:2 32:16 33:22
line 31:15	18:9,9 21:15,15	30:6	P 2:1,1 3:1,1 4:4	Portland 3:9,14
lines 19:8 24:19	motion 18:2 26:1		Pages 1:10	position 18:8
links 13:10,13	26:10	0	pandemic 26:25	positions 16:22
little 21:24 22:3	motions 23:16	O 4:4	paper 26:24	29:16 32:16
33:9	move 23:3 25:19,23	000 4:3	part 11:15 28:19,25	possibility 8:16 9:3
LLC 1:21	25:24 26:16	object 11:4 32:11	30:15 31:9	11:14 16:5 29:13
look 16:21 31:6	moved 25:16	objection 7:20	participated 20:14	possible 8:3,25
looked 14:12		12:23 18:22 23:22	participation 33:17	16:7 27:9 31:11
looking 14:22	N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N	24:3,10,18,20,23	particular 4:17	possibly 34:1
29:13	N 2:1 3:1 4:4	25:7,9 26:5,7	11:11	power 11:18,19
looks 8:8	name 4:13 5:25	27:23 31:17	parties 4:21,23 8:3	
L	1	ı	1	1

practice 23:25 24:5	provide 5:4 27:3	really 17:4 33:24	requests 24:15 25:3	12:20,25 13:4,5
31:24	provided 20:17	Realtime 1:21	requirement 24:7	13:13,16,21 14:12
precisely 33:24	provides 20:24	rebuttal 16:9,14	25:2,5,8 27:22	14:13,22 15:16,18
prefer 18:1 19:24	provisions 26:17	receive 12:8 27:13	28:2 31:22	15:21,22 16:18
prehearing 1:9 4:7	PSE 13:22 17:5	received 7:9 16:19	requirements 18:5	17:6,21,21 18:4
4:17 7:24 16:20	19:9 28:9 29:19	recess 15:15	26:24	18:10,13,15,21,24
21:4,8,17 24:8	30:25 31:16 33:12	recognize 22:8	requires 22:12	18:25 19:8,17,21
25:5 27:1,22 30:1	PSE's 4:12 13:20	recommend 16:9	26:22	20:22,24 23:4
31:23 32:21	18:2,10,15 26:10	recommending	resolution 13:24	24:13,17 27:18
prejudice 19:12	PSEDRS@perki	14:9 16:1	18:11,15 23:17	28:19,25 29:3,6
present 8:22 15:20	28:7	reconciled 9:7	resolve 19:10 20:4	34:4
31:24	public 2:16,18 4:19	record 4:6 12:20,23	resolved 13:1	schedules 8:7 23:20
prior 27:19	4:22 5:3,5,7,22	13:2,25 14:16,21	respects 23:11	scheduling 18:14
probably 9:24	6:1 10:6 17:17,17	15:8,11,11,14	respond 31:13	20:3,15
25:16,21 32:20,24	17:20 24:2 26:7	30:9	response 16:3	School 2:23
problem 33:6	27:25 28:18,20	redo 18:4	19:20,23,25 20:8	scope 30:1
procedural 4:25	29:2,5,6 30:4,7	referred 8:15	24:14	Seattle 1:22,23
8:2 14:12 23:4	32:5 33:1,2,3,7,11	regard 30:13	responses 25:3 26:4	2:19 3:5
34:4	33:21	regarding 4:11	results 11:19 12:2,4	second 16:2
proceeding 4:11,24	Puget 1:5 2:10 4:9	12:25 13:13 23:19	12:6,12	see 8:9 9:10,22
8:14,19 12:8	5:10,14	regular 10:12	review 14:5	13:18 14:17 19:23
17:24 24:15 25:4	purpose 4:19	rehearing 18:3	reviewing 17:13	29:3 31:1 33:3
27:14	Pursuant 1:6 4:10	related 23:4	RFP 11:15 12:2,4,6	seek 21:3,9,25,25
process 31:9 33:20	pushed 20:1	relevant 10:16	12:12	22:17
Project 2:21 6:10	put 9:23 18:23 19:7	remarks 5:8	right 7:5,9,21 11:9	seeking 14:5 21:22
6:12 7:11 18:19	32:25	remind 17:10	12:16 13:11 14:1	sense 11:6,22
pronouns 5:13,20	putting 32:6	Renewable 3:11,13	14:10,25 15:6,10	separate 11:23
6:1,7,20		6:22,25 7:11	16:13,17 17:16	22:22
proposal 17:2,5,14	Q	20:12,14	18:6,7,18 20:11	separated 13:12
24:25 29:22 31:6	question 14:4	REPORTED 1:20	20:20,21 22:1,6	serve 27:5,6
propose 14:11	quiet 22:3	reporter 22:2,4	24:6,11,21 25:1	service 26:22 27:4
proposed 8:7,10	quite 22:19	35:7	25:10,25 26:9,18	27:8 28:8,11
13:4,4,21 15:17	R	Reporting 1:21	28:1,10 29:11,24	set 21:16 27:19
15:21 16:18 17:21	R 2:1 3:1 4:4 35:1	representation	31:20 33:15 34:2	sets 21:5
18:13 19:9,18	raise 12:1 15:7	21:19	Road 2:23	setting 12:13
20:22,24 22:10	28:16	representative 27:8	role 29:23	settle 13:18
23:20 24:13,17	rate 8:13,24 9:8,18	representatives	rules 11:15 27:3	settlement 8:16,23
27:18 28:19 29:3	10:15,21,23 11:17	27:12	30:17 31:16 33:5	8:25 16:1,2,6,8
proposing 12:5	13:11,14,19 21:18	represented 7:13	S	17:8,12 19:18
14:18 16:21,22	21:23 22:19,24	representing 5:14	S 2:1 3:1 4:4	20:3 29:22 30:13
protecting 33:19	23:12 24:20	request 18:3 21:2		30:15,16,16 32:7
protections 26:12	reach 13:25 16:8	21:19 23:22	saving 16:8	32:8,24 33:5
protective 25:13,17	reached 30:16	requested 25:23	scarson@perkin 2:15	settlements 32:15
26:1,10,11,15,16	ready 13:17,18	requesting 26:11	schedule 8:2,10,17	shared 8:7 25:4
26:17	realized 9:21	26:15	8:19 9:3,23 10:13	sharing 30:13
			0.17 7.3,43 10.13	
L				

32:11 33:7	Staff's 15:21 17:1,5	Tack-Hooper 6:19	THURSTON 35:4	$oxed{\mathbf{v}}$
she/her 5:13 6:1,7	17:21 18:13 19:17	take 16:20 22:20	tied 12:6	valid 30:2
6:20	20:24 29:3	23:5 25:25 30:21	time 8:14 11:8 13:2	value 18:11 19:23
sheets 27:17	staffing 17:22	33:10,21	17:13,22 21:22	Van 3:8 6:6
Sheree 2:11 5:15	stake 14:4	taken 15:12	24:14 26:17 30:9	various 4:25 10:14
shorten 24:14	stakeholders 15:3	takes 17:21	31:24	verbal 7:3
shortening 24:19	standard 25:16	talk 13:17 31:10	timeline 20:17	VIRTUAL 1:9
shorter 19:8	26:14	talked 12:24	22:24	VOLUME 1:9
Shorthand 35:6	start 5:10	talking 17:11	timing 12:4,10	
shortly 34:4	State 35:3,7	targets 10:24	today 4:7,20 8:2	W
showing 10:14	Ste 2:23	Tayler 1:20 35:6,14	16:20 23:7 26:20	WAC 1:6 4:10
signal 22:18	stipulate 8:10	TBD 30:8	28:4	wait 11:21,22 13:18
signaled 22:17	Street 2:12	Telecom 17:24	top 17:23	waiting 9:24 19:10
significant 17:12	STROM 2:11	terms 26:21 31:21	topic 23:22	want 4:19 9:5
17:22 29:21 31:3	strongly 28:19	testimony 9:9	touch 26:19	13:15,18 15:7
significantly 19:12	subject 11:23	10:17 16:3,10,14	transcript 35:8	23:8,9,18 24:14
Simon 2:22 6:12	submission 22:18	19:20,24,25 20:5	Transportation 1:2	29:15 32:13
simon@ffitchlaw	submissions 20:23	20:8	1:16	wanted 14:20
2:24	21:7	thank 5:12,16,18	trial 4:24	Ware 3:12 6:24,24
simply 17:4 26:11	Suetake 2:17 5:24	5:20,21 6:2,8,13	true 35:8	20:13,13
single 8:10 18:24	5:25 10:5,5 11:2	6:21 7:1,18 9:13	trust 21:19	Washington 1:1,16
sjm@dvclaw.com	17:19,20 24:2	11:2,9,25 14:19	turn 7:5 14:15	1:17,22 2:8,13,19
3:10	26:7 27:25 30:3,5	15:23 16:13 17:7	24:16,21 30:25	2:23 3:5 4:1
skill 35:9	32:4,5	17:15,16,19 18:7	turning 8:1 23:8	30:24 35:3,7
Sommer 3:7 6:6	suggested 8:20	18:18,20 19:1,2	turns 11:5	wasn't 15:18
18:9 21:15	19:23	20:11,20 22:1,4,6	twenty 17:8	way 3:8 11:1 20:19
soon 27:9	suggesting 8:3	23:1 25:10 26:9	two 8:5,11,13,23	we'll 21:21
sort 31:22 32:11	suggestion 9:12	28:10,12 30:19	17:23 28:20	we're 4:7 9:18 12:5
sound 1:5 2:10 4:9	12:3,14	31:20 34:6	type 23:11	12:13 13:6,17,17
5:10,14 31:23	suggestions 12:17	that'd 10:9	typically 27:19	13:24,24 15:15
Southeast 1:16	Suite 1:22 2:13,18	theor- 9:14		17:11 20:3,16
speak 10:3 15:2,3	3:4,8,13	theoretically 9:14	U	21:16 22:9 24:20
specific 17:12,18	summer 29:11	things 10:24	UE-210795 1:4 4:8	we've 13:3,21 19:7
23:18 29:14 33:4	support 15:21 16:8	think 9:15,16,17,19	understand 15:17	23:25 28:6
33:8	17:5,8,20 18:6,10	9:21,25 11:4,7,21	30:19 31:7	website 5:5
specifically 9:10	18:15,22 19:8	11:25 13:1,3 14:7	understanding	wed 29:14
12:3 17:1	20:2 24:4 27:12	16:19 19:7,10	18:2 31:19 33:11	week 20:7 27:19
Square 1:16	30:10 31:14	21:15,17,21,22	33:14	weeks 12:25
staff 2:5 4:22 5:17	sure 10:6 21:12	23:1 25:23 28:5	understandings	Western 6:4
5:20 7:16 13:4	29:15,25 31:17	29:14 30:11 31:8	32:23	wish 5:3 7:19
14:11,15 15:2,17	32:13 33:24	31:21 32:12,17,19	Unit 2:18 6:1 10:6	Woodland 1:16
16:1,7,9,21 18:23	suspend 26:24	32:20,22 33:1,16	17:20 32:5	work 9:3 18:13,25
23:21,24 24:4,22	SW 3:8,13	Third 3:4	use 9:18 23:10	23:15 28:24 29:5
26:5 27:13,18		thought 33:23	useful 8:21 9:15	31:4 33:20
29:5	T	thoughts 17:18	11:3	works 9:4 18:24
	T 35:1,1		Utilities 1:2,16	
	I			l

, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				Page 42
	21-4-0.5-14-22	00110 2:22		
wouldn't 11:4,6	31st 8:5 14:23	98110 2:23		
writing 7:8 23:6	16:12	98503 1:17		
written 5:4 7:14,22	321 2:23	98504 2:8		
www.buellrealti	3358 1:20 35:14			
1:25	343-7340 3:5			
<u> X</u>	360 1:23 2:8			
	389-2055 2:19			
Y	4	_		
yeah 26:2,14	40128 2:7	_		
year 13:22 17:9,23	421 3:13			
19:11	425 2:14			
years 24:1	450 3:8			
	480-100-640 1:7			
Z	4:10			
Δ		_		
0	5	_		
1	503 3:14			
1-35 1:10	534-9066 1:23			
10:40 15:13		_		
10.40 13.13 10885 2:12	6	_		
10th 16:4	610 3:4			
11:05 34:7	621 1:16			
12th 16:10,15	635-1400 2:14			
1325 1:22	669-8197 2:24			
1400 3:13	6th 3:13			
14th 20:7	7	_		
16th 16:3 19:19	700 2:13	-		
1750 3:8	710-1154 3:9			
1840 1:22	710-1134 3.7			
1st 8:6	8			
	800 1:24 2:18			
2	810 3:4			
2000 2:18	846-6989 1:24			
2022 1:13 4:1 9:1		_		
2023 8:5,6 17:6	9	_		
20:1	9 1:13 4:1			
206 1:23 2:19,24	9:30 1:14 4:2			
3:5	9:47 15:13			
223-4544 3:14	915-4521 2:8			
23rd 16:2 19:19	971 3:9			
24th 9:1 16:7 20:2	97201 3:9			
25th 9:1 16:7 20:2	97204 3:14			
287-9066 1:23	98004 2:13			
	98101 1:22			
3	98104 2:19 3:5			
L	1	!	ı	1